DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 165 933 RC 011 098

AUTHOR Olivas, Michael A.
TITLE Hispanics in Higher Education: Status and Legal Issues.
PUB DATE 4 Oct 78
NOTE 35p.; Paper presented to the National Association of College Admissions Counselors (Bal Harbour, Florida, October 4, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Access to Education; Admission Criteria; Census Figures; Cultural Awareness; Cultural Differences; Educational Legislation; Educational Policy; *Educational Research; *Enrollment Trends; Equal Education; *Higher Education; Junior Colleges; Mexican Americans; Minority Groups; Puerto Ricans; Role Models; *Spanish Speaking; *Student Recruitment
IDENTIFIERS Chicanos; *Hispanos

ABSTRACT

In considering participation of Hispanic students in higher education, focus is on racial and ethnic data available, research on Hispanic students, education litigation and legal issues impacting on Hispanics, and recruitment. Though Hispanic enrollments in higher education have increased, high concentration of full-time undergraduates in two-year colleges (least-prestigious, least-funded institutions) carries resulting inequities. Graduate and professional enrollments are even bleaker than undergraduate statistics. Factors impacting on Hispanic participation in higher education include the shortage of highly trained Hispanic personnel to serve as catalysts for change and role models, lack of a federal policy on Hispanic higher education, few high level Hispanic appointments to agencies affecting national educational policy making, and little research attention to Hispanic students. Three research areas which do offer guides to improved access are models of student profiles, institutional research and marketing models, and Chicano student stress research. Legislative remedies are needed on census data and Title III administration, while legal issues include residency, desegregation, testing, and admissions. Improved recruitment is tied to surveys of Hispanic populations, examination of internal policies hampering Hispanics, use of Hispanic students in recruitment/monitoring, cultural awareness, and better support systems. (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED165933

OCT 1978
ERIC/CRESS
RECEIVED

Hispanics in Higher Education: Status and Legal Issues

Michael A. Olivas
Institute for the Study of Educational Policy
Howard University
Washington, D. C. 20008

A paper presented to the
National Association of College Admissions Counselors
Bal Harbour, Florida
4 October 1978

"I think it is fair to say that the educational needs of the Hispanic community are even greater than those that exist in the Black community."

Mary F. Berry, 1977

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Michael Olivas

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

RC 011098

Any attempt to categorize Hispanic educational issues in any arena must inevitably fail, for to summarize so complex a topic requires a self assurance bordering on arrogance. These issues, however, and the struggles facing minorities in higher education are disheartening, and it is with considerable humility that I face you this morning. For those of you who work on a daily basis with Hispanic students, I need not dwell on the scarcity of our students, and I certainly will not presume to tell you how these students differ from traditional populations.

Rather, I am prepared to discuss four items with you today: an overview of Hispanic participation in higher education, a short review of literature on Hispanic students, a summary of education litigation and legal issues impacting upon Hispanics, and recommendations for recruiting Hispanic students. I readily concede that each of these topics is a book theme, but it is important to set the context in any discussion of minority issues, particularly minority education.

A preliminary word needs to be said about Hispanic data, a topic to which I will return in my discussion of legal issues. Racial and ethnic data collected on minorities are subject to considerable enumeration and sampling errors (Hernandez, 1973; Fernandez, 1975; Abramowitz, ed., 1976), but Hispanic data are particularly prone to problems due to the ethnic diversity of our people and to the varying national origins of Spanish speaking Americans gathered under the Hispanic rubric. In the interest of time, I will not dwell on the complex problems associated with

Census Bureau data, National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) figures, or Office for Civil Rights (OCR) reports; it is sufficient, if only for the moment, to acknowledge the difficulties with, and inconsistencies among, sources for Hispanic data.

By planting doubt in your minds concerning the adequacy of such data, I do not mean that the depressing figures I will cite are any less real or the situation any less dire. Theoretically, it is possible that the data belie a good situation by underestimating the successes of Hispanic students. It is my impression, however, that the figures on our participation underestimate the severity of the problems, for my visits to campuses and discussions with Hispanics convince me that progress is minimal and that increasingly conservative events threaten even these incremental gains. Thoroughly wary of data problems, and cognizant of half-full/half-empty perceptions, I would like to share with you recent figures on the conditions of Hispanic higher education.

Minority enrollments have risen in the years since such data have been colleged regularly, and 1976 OCR figures indicate 409,664 undergraduate Hispanic students, 4.8% of all undergraduate students. Table One shows these data, and reports a major increase in Hispanic enrollments since the negligible figures reported in the early 1970's for our students. It is undeniable that our students have increased their access into postsecondary education, if by access, one means "ability to get into some college, somewhere." I would contend, however, that the necessary

corollary of access -- distribution -- is strikingly skewed against Hispanic students, and that this maldistribution masks inequities in the higher education of Hispanics.

There is a hierarchy of institutions in our country, in which most students attend open door or low-selectivity colleges, while fewer students are admitted into the elite universities. Figures unmistakably indicate that our students have access only into the lowest end of this continum, the two-year colleges (see Table 2). Of the minority groups, only Native Americans are more concentrated in two year colleges, a result of federal and tribal policies to establish two-year institutions for Native Americans.* Fifty-nine percent of Hispanic undergraduate students are in two year-institutions, in comparison to 45% of white students.

This concentration, per se, is not evidence of inequities, for an increasing number of white students enroll in two year institutions; indeed, nearly half of all undergraduates in the country attend two year colleges (Table 2). These institutions are designed to accomodate non-traditional students, and surely Hispanics constitute one portion of the newly-enrolled, "non-traditional" student clientele (Munday, 1976). Further, the demography of Hispanics and the growth of two-year colleges inevitably resulted in high Hispanic enrollments in these institutions, for comprehensive two year systems have developed in

*BIA funds three Indian institutions: Haskell Indian Junior College (KS), Institute of American Indian Arts (NM), and Southwestern Polytechnical Institute (NM).

California, Arizona, Texas, Florida, and New York -- population centers for various Hispanic groups.* Finally, the lower costs and open door admissions policies of most two year institutions do enable lower-SES families to enroll students, and these factors do enable Hispanics to attend postsecondary institutions.

As Alexander Astin (1975a) and others have noted, however, the accessibility of two-year institutions is accomplished at some cost to the quality of education received by students in these institutions, for two year students are less likely to take baccalaureate degrees than are four year enrollees, are less likely to have campus residential experiences, are recipients of less public educational subsidy, and are less likely to be exposed to high quality faculty. These relative deficiencies are willingly traded by many students who opt, quite consciously and deliberately, for part-time and evening coursework, continuing education, and the convenience and savings of commuter higher education. However, these tradeoffs are highly questionable for full-time students, those usually considered as "traditional." It is at this point that the Hispanic inequities become clear, for no minority group, save Indians,** has a higher concentration of full-time undergraduates in two-year colleges than do Hispanics. While full-time white students enroll 27% of their numbers in these institutions, 45% of Hispanic full time students are enrolled in this sector (Table 2).

*By no means are these exclusive areas either for resident or migrant Hispanics. For a comprehensive study of midwestern Chicanos, see (Cardenas, ed., 1976).

**Federal and tribal Indian two-year institutions are residential, mitigating the adverse consequences of commuter institutions.

Thus, it is clear that access into two year colleges for Hispanics has not been for part-time, non-traditional clientele, but instead for an inordinately and disproportionately large number of the Hispanic traditional college going students. The considerable research (e.g., Chickering, 1974; Astin, 1975b) indicating that residence facilitates retention suggests that a major factor affecting Hispanic higher education is lack of access into institutions with residential programs. Discussing the link between residential living and retention, Astin (1977, p. 17) has noted:

> Chicano college freshmen have a somewhat greater chance of dropping out than do white students or even other ethnic minorities. A closer inspection of the data, however, reveals that this difference is entirely attributable to the heavy concentration of Chicanos in community colleges. Among community college students, Chicanos have the same probability of dropping out as do other students. Among students entering four year colleges and universities, the drop-out rate among Chicanos is actually slightly less than the drop-out rate for other students. These differences dramatize how the demography of Chicanos can affect their subsequent educational attainment.

Other minority groups are similarly overrepresented in two-year colleges, although Hispanics and Native Americans seem most maldistributed. Asian students have surpassed majority high school completion and college completion rates (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1978, Figures 2.3, 2.4), while the network of Black institutions, most of them four year residential institutions, have historically provided a route of access for Black students (Blake et al., 1977). Hispanics lack such a network, and even those four year institutions that enroll Hispanic

majorities due to residential patterns have traditionally been administered by Anglos and held in fiduciary trust by Anglo boards (Arce, 1978).

Thus, Hispanics are concentrated in institutions that are the least-prestigious and least-well funded. The maldistribution of full time students suggests a distressing lack of opportunity at four-year institutions, one corroborated by baccalaureate statistics. Table 3 shows that Hispanics received 2.8% of all baccalaureate degrees awarded in 1975-76. The table also shows the percentage decline in degrees awarded to Hispanics, from 4.6 percent at the Associate degree level, to 1.2% at the doctorate level. Even the largest percentage share of degrees, at the A.A. level, falls below the percentage of enrollments for Hispanics. Recall that the 1976 figures for Hispanic undergraduates showed 6.2% of total two year enrollments (Table 2).

As discouraging as baccalaureate statistics are, graduate and professional Hispanic enrollments are even bleaker. Hispanic full-time enrollments in universities, those institutions with graduate programs, were 2.7% in 1976 (Table 4). This is, of course, a crude measure, for many full time students in these institutions are undergraduates, while many graduate students are part time. However, other measures of Hispanic graduate participation confirm underrepresentation, and show little progress through the early 1970's, a high water mark for affirmative action efforts. A National Board on Graduate Education report (1976) concluded, "Mexican and Puerto Rican Americans appear to

have the lowest participation rates relative to other ethnic and minority groups according to the figures presented here" (p. 45).

The figures, reported in Table 4, estimate that Hispanic graduate enrollments range between 1% and 1.4%. One would have expected a "pipeline" effect, that is, that affirmative action efforts would have increased the undergraduate pool of Hispanic students, leading to an increased graduate student body. This appears not to have happened, although those Chicano students who do enroll in graduate programs do well, requiring no more registered time in graduate school to obtain the doctorate than white students. Hispanic graduate students are slightly older than majority graduate students, and appear to stop in and out of graduate programs more so than white students, necessitating a longer total period of time to receive the doctorate (NBGE, 1976, Table 10).

Table 5 shows doctoral receipt figures for the years between 1973 and 1976. Combining Chicano and Puerto Rican totals results in 624 such doctorates, or less than 1% of all doctorates awarded in those years.* You will recall from Table 3 that in 1975-76 2.1% of all master's degrees went to Hispanics. These figures, when seen in tandem with the low graduate enrollment rates, indicate a severe shortage of highly trained Hispanic personnel to serve as catalysts for change and as role models for Hispanic communities.

---

*Moreover, the NBGE data indicate that the doctorates earned by Chicanos are earned at less-prestigious universities (1976, p. 57).

The Bakke case has focused our attention on professional school enrollments for minorities, and two unhappy facts became clear during the national debate over minority admissions: first, the national mood has changed and is no longer sympathetic towards overcoming inequities of minority education, and second, Hispanic professional school enrollments are pathetically low. Table 3 indicates the low level of Hispanic law and medical degree recipients, 2.6% and 2.3% respectively. The figures are particularly discouraging in light of the pressing legal and medical needs of Hispanics in barrios, where cultural and linguistic factors render less effective even the low level of care accorded by white professionals. For example, could majority, even simpatico, doctors treat anyone afflicted with mal de ojo? Could English speaking attorneys adequately represent Spanish-speaking clients?

Mindful of Justice Douglas' dissent in DeFunis, in which he contends that professional schools ought not be producing Chicano lawyers for Chicanos or Black doctors for Black clients, it is nevertheless imperative that more minority professionals be trained to serve minority communities and to integrate majority professional ranks. With these needs, it is with some sorrow that I review briefly the recent ABA tallies of Hispanic law enrollments. Chicano and Puerto Rican law school attendance in 1977 was down from the previous year (Table 6), and all Hispanic enrollments rose only from .6% of the 1969 total enrollment to 2% in 1976.

The lack of Hispanic professionals is a cyclic tragedy, for many Hispanic youths are being denied the crucial opportunities for interaction with role models from their communities, while institutions have few Hispanic leaders to initiate change. The lack of Hispanic graduate students translates into a negligible .6% Hispanic faculty percentage (Bayer, 1973, p. 31). The low faculty rates translate into similarly underrepresentative rates of Hispanic administrators (Goodrich et al, 1973, p. 30; Olivas, forthcoming). There are only 14 Chicano college presidents in the country, 12 of them in two year colleges (Olivas, 1978). The overseers of colleges, boards of trustees, are similarly white and male; a study of two year college boards (the institutions enrolling the bulk of Hispanic students) indicated that in the public sector, fewer than 2%, and in the private sector, fewer than .3% of the trustees were Hispanic (Drake, 1977, Table 2). It could be said that the lack of Hispanic access to postsecondary education is matched by the lack of opportunity for Hispanic leadership in these institutions.

Finally, and I promise then to end this funereal recitation of data, the very highest levels of educational policymaking lack comprehensive Hispanic representation. Not one state has a coordinating or governing agency headed by an Hispanic administrator, nor is any interstate higher education consortium or commission directed by Hispanics. We do have a national organization devoted to scholarly exchange among Hispanics, the National Chicano Research Network*, and its work is invaluable. But it

*For information, contact Dr. Carlos Arce, Survey Research Center, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106.

cannot overcome the years of neglect and underrepresentation at all levels of higher education.

Federal policy towards Hispanic higher education is nonexistent; Assistant HEW Secretary Berry's statement, quoted at the beginning, accurately summarizes the federal posture. High level appointments of Hispanics to HEW, USOE, and education components of other agencies have been few. Dr. Aguirre's short term service as Commissioner in the final months of the Ford presidency is, unfortunately, symbolic of the lack of Hispanic voice in determining educational policy in our country. Too often, the only positions for which Spanish-speaking people have been considered or appointed are bilingual education or affirmative action posts. Do not misunderstand me, for Hispanics in such positions are sorely needed, and such programs are vital. But these should not be the only access into decisionmaking for qualified Hispanic leaders, and it slights all Hispanics when the pattern of appointments is limited to these areas, however essential the aims of the programs.

I have dwelled on these figures in excruciating detail for two reasons. First, Hispanic data have a tendency to be lumped together with "minority" problems, never a high priority item on educators' or legislators' agendas. The problems confronting Hispanics are, in many ways, unique concerns, despite commonalities with other minorities and with the systemic educational problems faced by all students. I will speak more specifically to specific problems Hispanics face in the final sections on research, legal, and recruiting issues. Second, it is our

responsibility as educators attempting to serve student needs to familiarize ourselves with comprehensive patterns and systemic inequities so as to identify and root them out in our own institutions. In an optometrist's terms, both myopia and hyperopia cause imperfect vision.

It is no accident that I use vision, nearsightedness, and farsightedness as transitional devices at this point, for my reviews of research on students have revealed little attention to Hispanic students. In the voluminous literature on students, Hispanic students appear to be a large blind-spot. This is due, in no small measure, to professional apathy on the part of majority researchers, to the underrepresentation of Hispanics in graduate programs and faculties, and to low levels of federal and foundation support for Hispanic research projects. Racial and ethnic research is fraught with problems, and many majority researchers are unable to overcome these problems. Montero, for example, has noted, "Research among racial and cultural minorities is in its infancy, at least in terms of researchers being sensitive to the problems and needs of these special sets of respondents and in designing new theories and methodologies for understanding them" (Montero, ed., 1977, p. 3). Further, Hispanics present special problems regarding data needs, as I noted in my earlier remarks concerning Census and NCES problems. Other researchers have noted methodological problems in sociological studies (Ramos, 1973), migrant research (Zusman and Olson, 1977), and Chicano convict research (Davidson, 1974; Moore, 1977).

I could not hope to review or even catalog all the research on Hispanic students (see Leggett and Arce, comps., 1978 for such a catalog), so I will summarize findings from three projects involving Chicano students. I have chosen these three studies not to slight Puerto Rican, Cubano, or other Latino groups, but because I am most familiar with Chicano student research. I have chosen three types of student research, because they represent at least three of the highly important areas in which such research is critically needed for educators and policymakers. They are theoretical models of student profiles, institutional research and marketing models, and Chicano student stress research.

Cross (1971), among others, has maintained for a number of years that increased access would inevitably attract a "non-traditional" clientele, including more older, female, and minority students. Munday (1976), in an analysis of ACT test takers, compared non-traditional college bound students, including Chicanos, with traditional students. Briefly, he found Chicano students to be less willing to attend school far from home, to be less willing to pay higher tuition, to be more willing to attend a public two year college and less desirous of attending a private four year institution, to have lower aspirations in choice of degree, to be more likely to admit to a need for remedial help, to have lower ACT scores, to have come from a non-English speaking home, and to come from poorer families than traditional students. Of course, most of these findings corroborate many

of our own experiences working with Chicano students, but Munday has attempted to force policymakers to define the non-traditional clienteles differently, as the characteristics of age, attendance status, family income, and ethnicity mandate a more heterogeneous categorization.

He notes that policymakers have operated on principles "based on the erroneous assumption that relationships in college preferences for all or nearly all college students are the same and that these relationships are those of the traditional college student" (Munday, 1976, p. 698). This model of different clienteles possessing different characteristics and preferences for college is one with which all admissions officers are familiar -- different persons require different treatment. I will discuss some of these differences in my final section, on recruitment techniques.

A second research technique, in addition to student preference modeling is institutional research which is designed to study a given population and test its preferences for attending the institution. This marketing methodology is also familiar to you, as admissions staffs must know where potential students are and what can be done to match them with the institution (e.g., Leister, 1975; Bishop and Van Dyk, 1977). Such an analysis of preference was conducted by the Center for Chicano Studies at the University of Washington (Vasquez et. al., 1977), and while its findings are generalizable only to the high school sample of Chicanos in Washington, it is a good example to show the uses

to which social science research can be put in identifying and recruiting Hispanic students.

Of particular interest were gender-based differences in college preferences of the high school junior and senior students surveyed; these findings were at variance with traditional sterotypes of Chicana submissiveness and stifled ambitions. Females were more likely than males to rate academic and intellectual factors as important determinants of college choice, and more frequently indicated career interests requiring college than did males. Given these preferences, it was anomolous that females preferred junior colleges (to senior institutions) more than did males. Neither males nor females considered proximity to home an important factor in college choice.

Also important, and less surprising, was the discovery that few of the Hispanic students felt they received adequate career or college counseling in their high schools, and that over sixty percent of the students had made decisions not to attend college. These findings have obvious implications for admissions policies and practices, to which I shall turn in the concluding section.

The final research project I will share with you concerns levels of stress encountered by Chicano students and Anglo students. Munoz and Garcia-Bahne (1978) tested students in the top two tiers of the California public system (excluding the community colleges) for reactions to two stress-indices: stress intensity concerning various events, and a ranking of most- to least-stressful events (pp. 9-21).

Anglo males and females did not differ in their stress intensity patterns, but there were significant stress-intensity differences between Chicanas and Chicanos. In every instance, Chicanas and Chicanos reported higher levels of stress than Anglos, but Chicanas reported highest levels in each instance. Nevertheless, Chicana attrition rates were lower than Chicano rates, suggesting that the women were coping with their stress better than were the men; this evidence was strengthened by the higher academic achievement of Chicanas. The differences in stress encountered by white women and Chicanas suggests that culturally-based influences may have been more stressful than even gender-based influences. For both Chicanas and Chicanos, ethnic organizations and ethnic student contact were primary supportive systems.

Once again, these findings may corroborate your experiences with Hispanic students but research has as one of its fundamental ends the advancement of knowledge, and it is a fundamental tenet of my paper this afternoon that not many policymakers or educators have much knowledge of these Hispanic educational issues. So I share these data and research findings in the hope that they will assist you in your attempts to provide access to our students. Further, these studies suggest research agendas and action agendas for those who propose to do anything to bring equity to a system that provides little meaningful access to Hispanic students. The main agenda setter, the Carnegie Council on Policy studies in Higher Education (formerly the Carnegie

Commission), has never turned its attention to Hispanic issues -- a striking omission when contrasted to its otherwise-comprehensive attention span.

I would like briefly to suggest a legal agenda for consideration, for a number of these issues will require legal or legislative remedy, failing a major shift in public sentiment or institutional policies. Legislative issues include Census data and Title III administration, while legal issues include residency, desegregation, testing, and admissions. These agenda items are not as discrete or separate as any listing would suggest, and indeed, are complex and intertwined.

Census data problems were discussed earlier, when I introduced my remarks concerning Hispanic enrollment figures. It was in the context of racial and ethnic educational statistics that I faulted the Census Bureau data. However, as you know, Census data are primarily used for political and legislative purposes, including congressional redistricting, revenue sharing formulae, and governmental expenditure programs. Undercounting, sampling errors in minority populations, reluctance of enumerators to poll minority households or inability to speak Spanish all work against Hispanic interests in accurate counts. This problem may seem inappropriate in this forum, but all sectors of society have a vital interest in accurate data on our populations.

The need for understanding Hispanic patterns is equally clear in the administration of funds for Title III, Strengthening Developing Institutions. Since the inception of this program

in 1966, the percentage of money awarded to Spanish-speaking programs has increased only from 3% to 10% of the total, despite the larger percentage increase in the number of Hispanic undergraduates (recall Table 1). More importantly, the legislation and its regulations limit the percentage of funds that can be awarded to two year institutions to 24% of the total awards.* This provision sharply restricts the amount available for Hispanic programs, as our students are overwhelmingly clustered in two year colleges, and there is no network of historically-Hispanic higher education institutions at the senior level to apply for the 76%.

The Title III eligibility rules for special assistance have been relaxed to enable "such action (as) will substantially increase higher education for Spanish-speaking people,"** but as I have noted, the ceiling on two year college awards operates at cross purposes with this intent (Table 7). Only one member of the Advisory Council on Developing Institutions (of a 9 member board) is Hispanic, and there are no Hispanics from two year institutions.

I will be even more brief in my agenda setting for legal issues, for I do not wish to encourage any additional changes in educational policy by lawyers or judges. I am not by nature a litigious person, and I believe educators defer to or necessitate action by courts far too often in establishing a more

---

*Higher Education Act of 1965, Title III, Sec. 301 b(2), (3); 20 U.S.C. 1051.

**Sec. 302 (b). These rules were also relaxed for Indian programs.

equitable system of education. But in our society, litigation is a necessary tool. Aspira, MALDEF, and PRLDEF have been heroic in their struggles to improve life for Hispanics, and we all owe them our support and gratitude. I suggest this for their, and your, consideration.

Four areas have immediate utility for Hispanic recruitment, and will require research and analysis, and may require litigation, for clarification and administrative guidelines. These are residency, desegregation, testing, and admissions. While these issues have corollary concerns for elementary and secondary education, my brief remarks are focused upon higher education and professional school implications.

Residency, increasingly becoming an issue for undocumented children in public schools (Flores et. al., 1977) will have impact upon attendance status and ability to attend schools out of state for all students (Hendrickson and Jones, 1973), but could have significant impact upon Hispanics, especially migrants who wish to attend college and leave the migrant stream. Residency rules, designed to enable state residents to attend public colleges less expensively than out of state students, can render college completely inaccessible to migrants. Consider for a moment the commonly accepted means of certifying residence for tuition and fee purposes in a given state and contrast these with the migrant life. Ordinary documentation, periods of domicile, and normal attendance certification are impossible for migrants. Indeed, many families could not establish appropriate residence in any state!

An Hispanic group in Ohio, a heavily-agricultural state, brought this situation to the attention of the state higher education coordinating agency, and managed to secure a change in the Ohio Revised Code to accomodate migrant workers: "A person who has been employed as a migrant worker in the state of Ohio and his or her dependents shall be considered a resident for these [residence] purposes provided such person has worked in Ohio at least four months during each of the three years preceding the proposed enrollment."* Moreover, documentation for the exception was left to the discretion of each institution.

This exception admittedly would affect few persons, for few migrants or their families can lose workers or afford even in-state tuition rates. But the point to be made here is that there are systemic constraints to Hispanic enrollment, and we must root these out at each level. The need for Hispanic professionals in state agencies and educational institutions must also be reiterated, for policymakers will not, of their own accord, realize or correct such systemic inequities.

Like residency, desegregation is thought to be only a K-12 concern. Even in higher education, desegregation litigation, most notably the Adams v. Califano** case, concerns Black institutions and their role in ostensibly-desegregated state systems. However, in a public mood seemingly content with impressions of racial equity, all ethnic institutions are increasingly called

*ORC 3333-1-10 (D)(10)

**356 F. Supp. 92(D.D.C. 1973).

into question. Even though Hispanics have few identifiably-Hispanic institutions (and therefore, ironically, may have less to fear than do Blacks), we must be vigilant to see that those institutions serving our students receive adequate financial support and autonomy to serve Hispanic students. Proposition 13, and its clear impact upon community colleges in California, is an example of an event that could seriously jeopardize the only institutions into which Hispanics have real access. We cannot let down our guard, and all institutional and system-wide actions must be examined for possible adverse impact upon Hispanic students.

The final area of litigation is that of testing and admissions. The grim statistics I shared earlier make it clear that affirmative action has failed to increase Hispanic participation in significant ways, despite public perceptions regarding "dilution of standards" for minority applicants. Suffice it to say that we must continue to seek indices of college ability that accurately measure bilingual and bicultural characteristics, community service proclivities, and cognitive abilities. Testing and quantitative measures for admissions can serve to screen out non-traditional applicants (Romero et al., 1975; Padilla and Garza, 1977), and are incomplete gauges at best. No one knows this better than admissions officers, who admit to the fallibility of such indices, but who employ them as administrative devices to sort out large numbers of applicants for a smaller number of openings.

I end my survey of possible areas of litigation at this point, lest anyone accuse me of fomenting lawsuits or even of making veiled threats, for I do neither. As a researcher and administrator, I do concede it is easy to cast stones and far more difficult to construct workable programs. For our discussion, I would like to leave you with these suggestions:

(1) Encourage your institutions to survey Hispanic populations in your recruiting area. If other schools in your area are not recruiting Hispanics, widen your search area to ensure a large population.

(2) Encourage institutional officers to examine internal policies for their impact upon Hispanics. One school, for example, would not allow native speakers of Spanish to take Spanish by examination credit.

(3) Utilize Hispanic students in recruiting and monitor departmental admissions practices where there are no Hispanics in the departments.

(4) Organize Hispanic student organizations and involve community members in this support system.

(5) Use community contacts, social service agencies, and bilingual education personnel in school districts to recruit capable Hispanic students, and work closely with parents of students.

(6) Organize in-service seminars and workshops to make institutional personnel more aware of Hispanic culture and student characteristics.

(7) Carefully examine admissions policies and criteria for their impact upon Hispanic applicants.

(8) Work closely with all supportive service and academic personnel in your institutions to ensure Hispanic students receive adequate financial aid and academic counseling service.

(9) Encourage Hispanic students to get involved in a supportive student activity and instill in them a shared sense of responsibility for Hispanic activities and pride on campuses.

Reciting these, I am struck by how elementary and mundane my suggestions must sound to admissions professionals such as yourselves. I began by saying I would not presume to give you solutions, but only to share information. It is clear to me that even well-intentioned institutions fail to meet the needs of Hispanic students, and that ignorance of Hispanic issues is more often than not the root cause of apparent apathy on the part of educators. I suggest that these data and this discussion of Hispanic issues can serve to tap the reservoir of good will in the majority. Hispanics represent a people rich in tradition, culture, and service. Higher education is poorer for its failure to mine this resource.

Table One

Hispanic Undergraduate Enrollments, 1976

	Total Enrollments	Hispanics	
Full time	5,935,902	263,982	4.4%
Part time	2,577,408	145,682	5.7%
Total	8,513,310	409,664	4.8%

Source: OCR unpublished data and ISEP staff calculations.

Table Two

Hispanic Enrollments in Two-Year Colleges, 1976

	Aggregate Total	Hispanics	
Full time	1,690,775	119,444	7.0%
Part time	2,225,843	122,565	5.5%
Total	3,916,618	242,009	6.2%

$$\frac{\text{Hispanic full-time two-year students}}{\text{Hispanic full-time students}} \quad \frac{119,444}{263,982} = 45\%$$

$$\frac{\text{Aggregate full-time two-year students}}{\text{Aggregate full-time students}} \quad \frac{1,690,775}{3,916,618} = 43\%$$

$$\frac{\text{White full-time two-year students}}{\text{White full-time students}} \quad \frac{1,280,872}{4,820,716} = 27\%$$

SOURCE: OCR unpublished data; ISEP staff calculations.

Table Three

Degrees Awarded to Hispanics, 1975-76

		Total		Hispanic	Percentage
Associate					
	Male	256,782	Male	11,838	4.6
	Female	231,895	Female	10,876	4.7
	Total	488,677	Total	22,714	4.6
Bachelors					
	Male	503,226	Male	13,594	2.7
	Female	423,859	Female	12,626	3.0
	Total	927,085	Total	26,220	2.8
Masters					
	Male	165,971	Male	3,316	2.0
	Female	144,522	Female	3,063	2.1
	Total	310,493	Total	6,379	2.1
Law					
	Male	26,237	Male	697	2.7
	Female	6,246	Female	161	2.6
	Total	32,483	Total	858	2.6
Medicine					
	Male	11,294	Male	245	2.2
	Female	2,193	Female	59	2.7
	Total	13,487	Total	304	2.3
Doctorate					
	Male	26,016	Male	294	1.1
	Female	7,783	Female	113	1.5
	Total	33,799	Total	407	1.2

SOURCE: NCES, Condition of Education, 1978, Table 3.17.

Table Four
Hispanic Graduate Enrollments, 1970-1973

Source	Total	Hispanic	Percentage
OCR, 1970 (full-time)	392,362	4,830	1.2
Hamilton, 1971 (full, part-time)	286,755	2,895	1.0
OCR, 1972 (full, part-time)	406,093	5,903	1.4
NASULGC, 1972 (full, part-time)	495,478	5,536	1.1
ACE, 1973 (full, part-time)	372,964	3,994	1.1

SOURCE: In NBGE, 1976, Table 4.

Table Five

Hispanic Doctoral Recipients, 1973-76

(By Field)

Field	Total		Chicanos		Puerto Ricans	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Math	2946	328	14	1	5	-
Physics	3630	130	11	-	4	-
Chemistry	4801	472	21	-	4	1
Earth Sci.	1897	137	4	-	6	-
Engineering	6432	88	16	-	17	-
Bio Sciences	11736	2804	63	7	20	4
Psychology	6651	2948	39	6	21	7
Soc sciences	8664	2234	53	8	12	9
Arts, Humanities	11760	5198	77	33	23	10
Professional	3809	766	14	6	8	2
Education	18910	7719	201	49	35	30
Other	66	20	1	-	-	-
Unknown	14	3	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	81,316	22,847	514	110	155	63

(As percentage of total)

MALES

	1973	1974	1975	1976	1973-76
Total	21,747	20,085	19,888	19,596	81,316
Chicano	78	123	147	166	514
Percentage	.5	.7	.8	.9	.6
Puerto Rican	29	38	48	40	155
Percentage	.2	.2	.3	.2	.2

FEMALES

	1973	1974	1975	1976	1973-76
Total	5,077	5,182	6,101	6,487	22,847
Chicana	16	25	29	40	113
Percentage	.4	.5	.5	.6	.5
Puerto Rican	7	17	14	25	63
Percentage	.2	.3	.2	.4	.3

SOURCE: Gilford and Snynder, 1977, Table I-4; CHE, 27 March 1978, p. 18.

Table Six

Hispanic Law School Enrollments in ABA-Approved Schools, 1969-1977

	1969	1972	1976	1977
Total Law students	68,386	101,664	117,451	N/A
Hispanics (all groups)	548	1,446	2,375	2,547
Percentage	.6	1.4	2.0	N/A

(1976, 1977 analysis)

	1976	% of Total	1977	% N/A
Chicano	1,488	1.3	1,412	
Puerto Rican	331	.2	343	
Other Hispanics	556	.5	792	
Total Hispanics	2,375	2.0	2,547	

SOURCE: ETS, 1976; ABA, 1977.

Table Seven

Title III Spanish Speaking Program Funding, 1966-1976

(Percent of Funds in Total Appropriations)

Year	Black Colleges	Hispanic Programs	Native Americans	Other	Total
1966	61	3	--	36	100
1967	40	2	1	57	100
1968	47	3	1	49	100
1969	53	3	1	43	100
1970	57	2	1	40	100
1971	59	5	3	33	100
1972	60	5	4	31	100
1973	59	7	6	28	100
1974	57	7	7	29	100
1975	52	8	7	33	100
1976	49	10	8	33	100

(Spanish Speaking Program Funds, 1971-76)

Year		No. of Grants	Amount ($)
1971	Basic	14	1,613,000
1972	Basic	18	2,816,000
1973	Basic	23	3,556,000
1973	Advanced	3	2,220,000
1974	Basic	26	3,812,000
1974	Advanced	3	3,620,000
1975	Basic	24	4,336,000
1975	Advanced	10	3,609,777
1976	Basic	31	4,660,825
1976	Advanced	1	1,200,000
		153	$31,443,602

SOURCE: USOE, 1977, Table I, II.

Bibliography

American Bar Association, Law Schools and Bar Admissions Requirements (1977); Memorandum OS 7677-9. Chicago: ABA, 1977.

Abramowitz, Elizabeth, ed., Proceedings from the National Invitational Conference on Racial and Ethnic Data. Washington, D.C.: Institute for the Study of Educational Policy, 1976.

Arce, Carlos H. "Minorities in Higher Education: Recent Advances and Current Problems," in C. Smith, ed. Advancing Equality of Opportunity: A Matter of Justice. Washington, DC: Institute for the Study of Educational Policy, 1978, pp. 165-175.

Astin, Alexander. "The Myth of Equal Access in Public Higher Education." Address presented to the Conference on Equality of Access in Postsecondary Education, July, 1975, (1975a)

Astin, Alexander. Preventing Students from Dropping Out. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975, (1975b)

Astin, Alexander. "Equality of Access for Chicanos in Higher Education," in M. Perez, ed. Institute on Chicanos in Higher Education. Pasadena: National Association for Equal Educational Opportunities, 1977, pp. 16-18.

Bayer, Alan. Teaching Faculty in Academe: 1972-73. Washington, DC: American Council on Education, 1973.

Berry, Mary F. Remarks in Desegregation and Education Concerns of the Hispanic Community: Conference Report. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education, 1977.

Betances, S. "Puerto Ricans and Mexican Americans in Higher Education." The Rican: Journal of Contemporary Puerto Rican Thought, 1, No. 4 (May, 1974), pp. 27-36.

Bishop, John and Jane Van Dyk. "Can Adults Be Hooked on College? Some Determinants of Adult College Attendance." Journal of Higher Education, 68 (January/February, 1978), pp. 39-62.

Blake, Elias et al. Profile of Enrollments in the Historically Black Colleges. Washington, DC: Institute for Services to Education, 1977.

Cardenas, G., ed. Atzlan [monograph: "Chicanos in the Midwest"], 7, No. 2, (Summer, 1976).

Chickering, A. Communities Versus Residents. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

Cross, K. Patricia. Beyond the Open Door. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.

Davidson, T. Chicano Prisoners: The Key to San Quentin. New York: Random House, 1974.

Drake, S. Research Report: A Study of Community and Junior College Boards of Trustees. Washington, DC: AACJC, 1977.

Educational Testing Service. 1976 Review of Legal Education. Princeton: ETS, 1976; ETS staff calculations.

Fernandez, E. Comparison of Persons of Spanish Surname and Persons of Spanish Origin in the United States. Washington, DC: US Bureau of Census, 1975.

Flores, Felipe et al. "Right of Undocumented Children to Attend Public Schools in Texas." Chicano Law Review, 4 (1977), pp. 61-93.

Gilford, D. and J. Snyder. Women and Minority Ph.D.'s in the 1970's: A Data Book. Washington, DC: National Academcy of Sciences, 1977.

Goodrich, A. et. al. "Minorities in Two-Year Colleges: A Survey." Junior College Journal, 43 (December/January, (1972-73) pp. 28-31.

Hendrickson, R. and M. Jones. "Nonresident Tuition: Student Rights v. State Fiscal Integrity." Journal of Law and Education, 2, No. 3 (1973), pp. 443-460.

Hernandez, J. et al. "Census Data and the Problem of Conceptually Defining the Mexican American Population." Social Science Quarterly, 53, No. 4 (1973), pp. 671-687.

Leggett, D. and C. Arce, compilers. Chicanos in Higher Education: A Bibliography. Ann Arbor: Survey Research Center, 1978.

Leister, D. "Identifying Institutional Clientele: Applied Metamarketing in Higher Education Administration." Journal of Higher Education, 46, No. 4 (July/August, 1975), pp. 381-398.

Lopez, R. et al. Chicanos in Higher Education: Status and Issues. Los Angeles: UCLA Chicano Studies Center, 1976.

Montero, D. ed. Journal of Social Issues [monograph: "Research among Racial and Cultural Minorities"], 33, No. 4 (1977).

Moore, J. "A Case Study of Collaboration: The Chicano Pinto Research Project." Journal of Social Issues, 33, No. 4 (1977), pp. 144-158.

Munday, L. "College Access for Nontraditional Students." Journal of Higher Education, 47, No. 6 (November/December, 1976), pp. 681-699.

Munoz, D. and B. Garcia-Bahne. A Study of the Chicano Experience in Higher Education. San Diego: Unpublished manuscript (National Institute of Mental Health Grant No. MN24597-01), 1978.

National Board on Graduate Education. Minority Group Participation in Graduate Education. Washington, DC: NBGE, 1976.

National Center for Educational Statistics. The Condition of Education, 1978 Edition. Washington, DC: GPO, 1978.

"Number of Doctorates Awarded in the United States, 1973-76." Chronicle of Higher Education, 27 March 1978, p. 18.

Ohio Revised Code. Sec. 3333-1-10 (D)(10).

Olivas, M. "Chicano College Presidents, 1977-78." Washington, DC: Unpublished manuscript, 1978.

Olivas, M. Minorities in Two Year Colleges: The Illusion of Access. Washington, DC: Howard University Press, forthcoming.

Padilla, A. and B. Garcia. "IQ Tests: A Case of Cultural Myopia." P. Houts, ed. The Myth of Measurability. New York: Hart, 1977, pp. 124-136.

Ramos, R. "A Case in Point: An Ethnomethodological Study of a Poor Mexican American Family." Social Science Quarterly, 53, No. 4 (March, 1973), pp. 905-919.

Romero, L. et al. "The Legal Education of Chicano Students: A Study in Mutual Accommodation and Cultural Conflict." New Mexico Law Review, 5 (May, 1975), pp. 177-231.

United States Commission on Civil Rights. Social Indicators of Inequality for Minorities and Women. Washington, DC: USCCR, 1978.

United States Office of Education, Advisory Council on Developing Institutions. Annual Report, March 1977. Washington, DC: ACDI, 1977.

Vasquez, J. et al. Problems and Preferences in Attending College: A Survey of Spanish Surname High School Students in the State of Washington. Seattle: University of Washington Center for Chicano Studies, 1977.

Zusman, M. and A. Olson. "Gathering Complete Response from Mexican-Americans by Personal Interviews." Journal of Social Issues, 33, No. 4 (1977), pp. 46-55.